UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,501	12/11/2001	Kerry Champion	23982-11568	6519

758   7590   03/16/2009
FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER
MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2445	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/015,501	CHAMPION, KERRY
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	ADNAN MIRZA	2445	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 February 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-56* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,17,33,41 recite the limitation "Traffic Manager" in first 3 lines of the claim language. The first 3 lines of the claim state, "Traffic manager for facilitating communication in accordance with at least one policy between a client node and a server node wherein the client node and the server node have at least one policy between a client node and a server node". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abjanic (U.S. 6,134,589) and further in view of Tuatini (U.S. 2002/0010781).

As per claims 1,17,33,41-42,53-54,56 Abjanic disclosed traffic manager for facilitating communication in accordance with at least one policy between a client node and a server node wherein the client node and the server node have at least one policy between a client node and a server node have at least one distinguishing characteristic includes more than having

distinguishing network addresses the server node having a first interface associated therewith (col. 4, lines 12-20) to one ordinary skill in the art the Traffic manager arranges/facilitates the incoming request and determines which side makes the request becomes the client. The request has been communicated to different available servers having different network IDs by following one policy in this case a round robin policy, the client node having an existing interface associated therewith, the traffic manager capable of communicating with both the client node and the server node and comprising a central processing unit which is operable to: communicate with the server node via the first interface, (col. 9, lines 56-67). One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention knows that traffic manager or director receive the client request and routed it to the proper node or server. The traffic manager has central processing unit that receives the message and forward it to destination node or server.

However Abjanic did not disclose in detail wherein the first interface is incompatible with the existing client interface because of the at least one distinguishing characteristic; generate at least a second interface for communication with the first interface; in accordance with at least one policy; wherein the at least one policy provides a mechanism to bridge the at least one distinguishing characteristic and publish the second interface thereby allowing the client node to access at least one service on the server node in accordance with the at least one policy.

In the same field of endeavor Tuatini disclosed, that is, a different implementation of a container adapter is used for each possible container type, and in this way the application programs can be independent of the type of container. In particular, the application framework defines the

interface between the container adapter and the application program. The application architecture

specifies that an application program is divided into translation logic 203, business logic 204,

and view logic 205. The business logic receives requests for services or functionality in an

application-specific format, services the requests, and provides responses to the requests in an

application-specific format. The translation logic is responsible for translating the requests

received from a client system in a client-specific format into the application-specific format

defined for the business logic. The view logic is responsible for generating and sending a

response that is in the client-specific format using the view and response specified by the

business logic. The translation logic, business logic, and view logic may use the services of the

service framework 206 to implement their functionality (Page. 3, Paragraph. 0064). One ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention the translation logic is interpreted as Bridge where the

distinguish characteristic is represented as client specific format. According to the application

program the frame work defines the interface to implement their functionality.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made

to have incorporated that is, a different implementation of a container adapter is used for each

possible container type, and in this way the application programs can be independent of the type

of container. In particular, the application framework defines the interface between the container

adapter and the application program. The application architecture specifies that an application

program is divided into translation logic 203, business logic 204, and view logic 205. The

business logic receives requests for services or functionality in an application-specific format,

services the requests, and provides responses to the requests in an application-specific format.

The translation logic is responsible for translating the requests received from a client system in a

client-specific format into the application-specific format defined for the business logic. The

view logic is responsible for generating and sending a response that is in the client-specific

format using the view and response specified by the business logic. The translation logic,

business logic, and view logic may use the services of the service framework 206 to implement

their functionality as taught by Dick in the method of Abjanic to provide a practical way for user

communication devices to carry out communication by translating it into specific format by

defining a interface and different protocol. It resulted in reducing latency and increasing

productivity.

3.   As per claims 2,18,34,43,55 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the first and second

interfaces comprises Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) interfaces (Tuatini, Page. 12,

Paragraph. 0104).

4.   As per claims 3,19 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the SOAP interfaces employ

Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0064).

5.   As per claims 4,20,35 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein each of the first and second

interfaces has a description language file associated therewith defining the associated interface

(Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0064).

6.   As per claims 5,21,36 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the first interface corresponds

to one of HTTP, TCP, HTTPS, HTTPR, and MQ (Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0063).

7.   As per claims 6,22 Abjanic-Dick disclosed wherein the distributed computing

environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise including the server node,

and wherein the client node is external to the network (Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0064).

8.   As per claims 7,23 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the distributed computing

environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise and including both the

client and server nodes (Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0064).

9.   As per claims 8,24,40,44 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the at least one policy

includes requiring authorization by a human operator for invocation of the at least one service

(Abjanic, col. 10, lines 1-12).

10.   As per claims 9,25,41,45 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the at least one policy

includes mapping an organizational role to a person (Abjanic, col. 10, lines 1-12).

11.   As per claims 10,26,46 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the mapping of the

organizational role to the person is done using an LDAP directory associated with the distributed

computing environment (Tuatini, Page. 21, Paragraph. 0169).

12.   As per claims 11,27,37,47 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the at least one policy is a

security policy (Tuatini, Page. 10. Paragraph. 0093).

13.   As per claims 12,28,48 Abjanic-Dick disclosed wherein the security policy is associated

with encryption or decryption of at least a portion of data which is exchanged between the client

and the server (Abjanic, col. 10, lines 1-12).

14.   As per claims 13,29,49 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the security policy is

associated with generating or verifying at least one digital signature for at least one portion of

data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Abjanic, col. 10, lines 1-12).

15.   As per claims 14,30,38,50 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the security policy is

associated with protection against service attacks (Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0066).

16.   As per claims 15,31,39,51 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the at least one policy is

associated with enforcing policies with respect to publication or access to the first or second

interfaces (Tuatini, Page. 3, Paragraph. 0066).

17.   As per claims 16,32,40,52 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the at least one policy is

associated with review of data communicated between the server and client nodes (Tuatini, Page.

3, Paragraph. 0066).

18.   As per claim 54 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed a computer-implemented method for

facilitating communication between server and client programs, the method comprising:

reading a WSDL file associated with a first SOAP interface to at least one server program

(Tuatini, Page. 14, Paragraph. 0126); and generating or publishing at least a second SOAP

interface corresponding to the first SOAP interface in accordance with at least one policy;

wherein at least one client program can use the second SOAP interface to request one or more

services (Tuatini, Page. 2, Paragraph. 0090).

19.   As per claim 55 Abjanic -Tuatini disclosed wherein the method further comprises:

reading a first UDDI file which lists the first SOAP interface; generating or publishing a second

WSDL file which describes the second SOAP interface; and creating or updating at least one

UDDI entry associated with the generated or published WSDL file (Tuatini, Page. 4, Paragraph.

0071).

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-56 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

21.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner

should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

22.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business

hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-

746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

23.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for un published

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

/A. M. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 2445

Adnan Mirza

/Larry D Donaghue/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454